UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,238	04/22/2005	Hiroshi Ashiya	Q86307	9061

23373   7590   03/17/2008
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
NOORISTANY, SULAIMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2146	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/532,238	ASHIYA, HIROSHI
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit
	SULAIMAN NOORISTANY	2146

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

THE REPLY FILED <u>22 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

    a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

    b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

    (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

    (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

    NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____.

    Claim(s) objected to: _____.

    Claim(s) rejected: _____.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

    <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/JEFF PWU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant Argument:
    Claim 1 recites "relaying an access from a client to the server for the network- connected equipment to perform the processing."
The Examiner has not cited any aspect of Negishi for teaching the claimed network-connected equipment. Most likely since Negishi does
not teach a network-connected equipment wherein the network-connected equipment does not have a user interface, let alone the
transferring of data from a server on a network to a network- connected equipment.

Examiner's response:
    It is the claims that define the claimed invention, and it is claims, not specifications that are anticipated or unpatentable. Constant
v. Advanced Micro-Devices Inc., 7 USPQ2d 1064.
    Examiner has read the claim limitation in question by the evidence provided in the applicant's specification, Figs.!
Fig. 1 clearly depicts the interface accessing request from the element 2 via Intranet, element 5.
    Ref. Negishi does the same. Therefore examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicant Argument:
    In the Office Action the Examiner asserts that Negishi teaches the claimed feature of "creating a transfer-data to be transferred to
the client as a response to the access to the server at the relaying."

Examiner's response:
    Please see Fig. 1, where Document Server unit 30 creates the transfer data to be transferred to the client as a response to the
access to the server at the relaying.
    Ref. Negishi does the same. Therefore examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicant Argument:
    Negishi neither teaches nor suggests the feature of "wherein the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-
connected equipment".

Examiner's response:
    Please see Fig. 1, where Rely Server unit 20 performances includes a proxy server, a converter, a script execution unit, a script
cache, which serves as script storage means, an authentication/accounting device, and a document cache, which serves as document
storage means. In addition, the client connects itself to the document server via the proxy server of the relay server, and the relay server
converts a document received from the document server (Note: wherein the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-
connected equipment) by using the converter. Then, the converted document is returned to the client and is displayed by using the browser.

    Ref. Negishi does the same. Therefore, examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicant Argument:
    Negishi neither teaches nor suggests of a transfer-data processing by the network-connected equipment, the transfer-data
processing including acquiring the transfer-data created at the creating of the transfer data.

Examiner's response:
    Please see Fig. 1, where Rely Server unit 20 performances includes a proxy server, a converter, a script execution unit, a script
cache, which serves as script storage means, an authentication/accounting device, and a document cache, which serves as document
storage means. In addition, the client connects itself to the document server via the proxy server of the relay server, and the relay server
converts a document received from the document server (Note: wherein the transfer-data includes a processing data for the network-
connected equipment) by using the converter. Then, the converted document is returned to the client and is displayed by using the browser.
    Ref. Negishi does the same. Therefore, examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicant Argument:
    Negishi fails to disclose the claimed feature of a transfer-data processing by the network-connected equipment, the transfer-data
processing including acquiring the transfer- data created at the creating of the transfer data, extracting the processing data from the
transfer- data, and performing a processing on the extracted processing data.

Examiner's response:
    Please see Fig. 1, according to Negishi, there is provided a conversion method for receiving a document and a script from a
document server. The conversion method includes: a storage step of extracting at least the script from the document and the script and
separately storing the script in a storage unit.
    Ref. Negishi does the same. Therefore, examiner maintains the rejection.

Applicant Argument:
Negishi neither teaches nor suggests a predetermined special-character string for identification indicating a data area where processing-
data to be processed by the network-connected equipment is described in a comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language
format data. Rather, Negishi discloses that the A tag designates the   URI as the href attribute so as to link, or anchor, to WWW resources.

Examiner's response:

Please see figs. 3-4, according to Negishi a document described in HTML, such as that shown in FIG. 3, is input into the converter, and then, a script indicated by script tags is detected and deleted from the document. The script is then stored in the script cache.

Applicant Argument:

Negishi neither teaches nor suggests a predetermined special character string described in a comment portion in a comment tag of the markup language format data, as Negishi discloses nothing about a comment portion in a comment tag.

Examiner's response:

Please see figs. 3-4, according to Negishi a document described in HTML, such as that shown in FIG. 3, is input into the converter, and then, a script indicated by script tags is detected and deleted from the document. The script is then stored in the script cache.

.